**NBDC Stakeholder Forum and National Platform Meeting**

**Template to be completed through the Meeting and beyond**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Emerging Key messages  (including revisions, supporting comments) | Emerging evidence and examples to support this – strength of evidence? | Existing or planned outputs including where/with whom we can find these (maps, reports, studies, theses, journal articles, videos, blogs…) | Influencing targets – who we want to get the message to, with whom and how (including opportunities) |
| Message 1 Local community empowerment and leadership | | | |
| * Genuine empowerment required in practice rather than just talked about |  |  |  |
| * Support and recognition for local institutions, particularly legally e.g. link btw community watershed associations and kebele administration |  |  |  |
| * No clear roles and responsibilities for community watershed associations. Not properly recognised by kebele. |  |  |  |
| * Degree of tension between kebele instigated inititatives and community instigated initiatives- problems of politics and misunderstanding |  |  |  |
| * Needs to be endorsed at Federal and Regional level and clarified with woredas and kebeles- institutionalised |  |  |  |
| * Issues around who are selected to represent community- i.e. model farmers, 1 to 5 leaders don’t necessarily represent those farmers who are ‘outside the game’. Clear and specific criteria should be defined to ensure adequate representation |  |  |  |
| * Slow process, continuous communication and facilitated dialogue required |  |  |  |
| * Kebeles/woredas reluctant to relinquish control- problem of devolving responsibilities to farmers because they will lose power/control/current roles |  |  |  |
| * Do local agents have the required skills to facilitate these processes? Capacity building required |  |  |  |
| * Regional Bureau of Agriculture responsible for providing training and capacity building- this needs to be reviewd, revised and amended to make it effective. Things exist in theory but need to be improved in terms of implementation. |  |  |  |
| * Other actors (outside government) are required to help this process, to work with and support existing government structures. Can identify potential actors but there needs to be systematic review of current structures/processes to identify gaps/weaknesses and then cite potential partners/stakeholders |  |  |  |
| * Many of these recommendations are easier said that done. Lots of talk about partnerships etc but many are not that effective in practice. |  |  |  |
| * Current research and interventions are not endorsed by community members, this is essential for community empowerment. (This may depend on the research topic) |  |  |  |
| * Community appropriate communication tools needed, visual, practical mechanisms to ensure transparent and clear communication of agendas/ideas. |  |  |  |
| * Pre-consultation and discussion/endorsement is required before any intervention. Very important to give sufficient time for this process. Must stop rushing! Conflict between need for outcomes and genuine participation e.g. farmer field schools administrated by JICA lasted 52 weeks but tailored to farmer schedules! |  |  |  |
| * Higher level decision makers won’t accept the need for slow processes- to convince people there should be some analysis of the approaches taken so far, the costs (what was the money spent) and the outcomes of previous approaches and the lack of success. Need to show data/strong evidence to prove this. |  |  |  |
| * Land rights a major bottleneck for community empowerment- very sensitive issue- land certification is addressing this to some extent but more research required to see whether there is a positive effect on farmer investments/management on their land. More awareness raising for farmers about what they are able to do under the certification. |  |  |  |
| * How realistic is it to bolster existing community institutions? Sometimes these are not the best mechanisms to work through because of how they are viewed by the government. Perhaps more releastic to work with government institutions but ensure that they are representative and tailored to community needs. Genuinely owned by community members. This requires transparent processes which are currently lacking. Look at Panchait organisations India. |  |  |  |
| * Questions around who to influence with these messages? Some idea that Federal and Regional levels need to ensure that genuine community empowerment processes are institutionalised as part of what woredas and kebeles do, but this conflicts with resistance within communities (although this varies from place to place) to government led interventions. A question for further research/investigation. |  |  |  |
| Message 2 Integration local and scientific knowledge | | | |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Message 3 Facilitation learning processes | | | |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Message 4 Incentives for success | | | |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Message 5 Strengthening human resource capacities | | | |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Message 6 Planning, evaluation and learning tools | | | |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |